

24 February 1961

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Document Division

SUBJECT: Revised processing procedure for Air Force and OO/C documents

REFERENCE: Document Division memos, this subject, 7 February 1961

1. The proposals for a revised procedure for microfilming documents received from Air Force and OO/C have been studied from the viewpoint of the effects which such a change would have upon Machine Division operations. The items listed below are based upon these two considerations: (1) Prior microfilming of only two classes of documents would require the parallel operation of two processing systems. (2) Machine Division programs for the new Intellofax system were designed to permit a reduction of manpower used for input to allow a corresponding increase in personnel assigned to output within the present T/O.

2. At present, the flow of documents through coding, keypunch and microfilming allows Machine Division to control the various stages of processing by means of the reel and flash number. Advantages derived from this control are:

- a. Manual sequencing of documents will not be necessary when Bell and Howell equipment is employed for preparation of index cards.
- b. VME source cards are prepared mechanically.
- c. Source cards for the Library (except non-25 under 25 control) are mechanically prepared.
- d. Film aperture cards are prepared without manual key-punch.

3. Prior microfilming will require a return to the batch and document number method of processing Intellofax. The following changes would be necessary for Machine Division processing:

- a. A separate operation must be added for key-punching aperture work cards. Additional time of .5 persons.
- b. Flash and reel number would not appear in Intellofax work cards. Therefore, MD would be required to send aperture assembly cards to VME, and produce a second deck for NSA. This could be avoided if the Document Analyst picks up the reel and flash numbers from the document, but the number of pages (used in MD to determine mechanically the necessary number of aperture cards) still would not be entered.

3. ID could not furnish the Library with a second source card for V items.
4. Separate processing plus sorting on 14 columns rather than seven would require the time of .5 additional personnel.
5. Batch number would have to be punched, and header cards sorted by batch and document number.
6. The present system allows immediate correction of errors. The alternative would be to give work cards to Document Division, requiring the analyst to read the document in the Library.
7. Two separate sets of cards would be required from NLS, arranged in one instance by batch number and in the other by reel and class number.
8. In view of the complexity created by parallel operation of two systems, and the added manpower requirements, it is our belief that it would be preferable to operate only one procedure for microfilming.

If Document Division, the Library and Machine Division can design an efficient procedure for prior microfilming all documents which will permit the mechanical controls now in use, there may be sufficient benefit to justify a totally new program.

It is our recommendation that all documents be processed alike, using whatever procedure ensures the most effective handling for Document Division, the Library and Machine Division.

STATINTL

[REDACTED]
Chief, Machine Division